

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 22, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,914,560 to *Winsor*.

Claims 6-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Winsor* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,859,508 to *Ge, et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,561,343 to *Lowe*, and U.S. Patent No. 5,811,927 to *Anderson, et al.*

Claims 18-21 are objected to as being independent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant amends claims 1 and 23. Accordingly, claims 1-23 are pending for further consideration. Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the indication that claims 18-21 are allowable.

All Subject Matter Complies With 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-5, 22, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,914,560 to *Winsor*. These rejections are respectfully traversed in view of the above amendment to independent claims 1 and 23 and the following comments.

Newly amended claims 1 and 23 recite “a plurality of supporters selectively arranged on an entire surface of the first substrate . . . to prevent the light scattering layer from subsiding.” At least these features are not shown in *Winsor*.

Winsor shows clear acrylic spacers (183) in Fig. 3A that support the light guide (180) directly above it. However, the spacers (183) are located at each end of the light guide (180) and are not “arranged on the an entire surface” as recited in claims 1 and 23. Thus, *Winsor* cannot anticipate claims 1 and 23.

As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, a claim is anticipated by a prior art reference only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn because *Winsor* does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1 and 23, as proposed to be amended.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2-5 and 22 are also allowable insofar as they recite the patentable combinations of features recited in claim 1, as well as reciting additional features that further distinguish over the applied prior art.

All Subject Matter Complies With 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 6-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Winsor* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,859,508 to *Ge, et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,561,343 to *Lowe*, and U.S. Patent No. 5,811,927 to *Anderson, et al.*. These rejections are respectfully traversed in view of the above amendments to independent claim 1 and the following comments.

Newly amended claim 1 recites “a plurality of supporters selectively arranged on an entire surface of the first substrate . . . to prevent the light scattering layer from subsiding.” At least these features are not taught or suggested by the references of record.

Winsor shows clear acrylic spacers (183) in Fig. 3A that supports the light guide (180) directly above it. However, the spacers (183) are located at each end of the light guide (180) and are not “arranged on the entire surface” as recited in claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that none of the other references of record make up for the deficiencies of *Winsor* above-mentioned. That is, none of the references of record teach or suggest “supporters selectively arranged on an entire surface of the first substrate . . . to prevent the light scattering layer from subsiding.”

In the present case, neither *Winsor* nor the other cited references of record, either alone or in combination teach or suggest at least the above-mentioned features recited in claim 1 as amended. Thus, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 6-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Accordingly, claims 6-17 are allowable for the same reasons set forth with respect to independent claim 1 from which they depend and for the separate features they recite.

Claims 18-21 are objected to as being independent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 18-21 are allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 1 is allowable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claims 18-21 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: Mary Jane Boswell
Mary Jane Boswell
Reg. No. 33,652

Date: January 28, 2003

Customer No. 009629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20004
Tel.: (202) 739-3000

MJB/DEC/fdb